



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/608,008	06/30/2000	Toshihiro Nakayama	P19355	9559
7055	7590	12/17/2003	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			YANG, RYAN R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2672	

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/608,008	NAKAYAMA, TOSHIHIRO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ryan R Yang	2672

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. Other: _____.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Per claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-18, 22-24 and 28-37, applicant alleges examiner does not provide adequate motivation to co combine Plunk with Endoh. In reply, examiner considers Endoh has provided all the elements of editing a picture as claimed. What's lacking in Endoh is a database of survey map generated from photogrammetric measurement. Plunk discloses a method of generating a database of survey map generated from photogrammetric measurement. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Plunk into Endoh in order to automatically generate realistically three dimensional view of a scene.

Applicant alleges there is no connection between Endoh who discloses an information recording/reproducing apparatus and Plunk whose teaching is related to photogrammetry or survey. Examiner notes the database generated by Plunk is a database of information or map (which can also be considered as pictures), therefore is useful in Endoh's application.

Applicant alleges Endoh does not disclose "visually displays a connection relationship between pictures displayed on said editing-display area of said scene". Examiner notes Endoh does disclose the feature in Figure 38 between B2 and A5. Applicant Plunk does not disclose a "connection relationship between pictures displayed on said editing-display area of said scene". Examiner notes that although Plunk does not show a connection relationship between pictures, Endoh does have the feature in Figure 38 with connection B2 and A5. Per claim 34-37, applicant alleges Endoh does not disclose any two photographs featuring the same "photographed target". In reply, examiner notes the argued limitation is not the claimed limitation..



MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600